

A
R E P L Y
T O
Mr. Tho. Beverley's Answer
T O M Y
R E A S O N S

Against his Doctrine of the
Thousand Years
Middle Kingdom, and of the
Conversion of the Jews.

By *Richard Baxter*, passing to that World where
we shall see face to face.

Feb. 20. 1691.

L O N D O N,

Printed for *Tho. Parkhurst* at the Bible and Three
Crowns in Cheapside, near *Mercers Chapel*. 1691.

AD pag. 1. You say very well against catching at words, and surmising strange Opinions: But if an excellent Divine will speak strange and dangerous words, the Reader must have an Antidote, and it is time enough to forgive the Writer when he confesseth the Errour of his words. He that speaketh ill, and meaneth well, should keep his meaning to himself till he can and will intelligibly express it.

To your pag. 2. He were malignant that would not acknowledge your Candour: And it is an encouragement to us that differ from you, that you believe our part in that Kingdom which it is not given us yet to see. And as you profess your patient bearing of Contradictions, we should love each other the more for our likeness. Though I am noted to have too sharp a reproving style, I do profess that I can bear more than I use; yea, that I love Reproof and my Reprovers.

To your pag. 3. And your confidence of your right Interpretation of Prophecies, and of the blessed 1697 year, I say but 1. As *Jeremiah* to the Prophets of his time—*Amen*. My wishes accompany you further than my belief (but not to the unhappy end of your New Earth.) 2. And I know how natural it is for every man to be over-confident of his conceptions, and his way to be right in his own Eyes.

To your pag. 4. The description of your Conformity, and recesses from it, is very modest and discreet. I named you not among Conformists as an Accuser, but as excusing the Nonconformists, to whom your Millenary Opinion is by unrighteous men imputed, whiles it is Conformists that are its strongest Pillars.

But if it be not the Sacred Office that you disclaim, but the bare name κληρῶν, are not those Officers Christ's more special κληρῶν, though the Laity also are his common Lot. You love not, I hope, Controversies about meer names and words: But if you do, let *Acts* 1. 17. silence you, καὶ ἐλαχεν τὸν κληρὸν ὃ διακονοῦν τῷ κυρίῳ, yet *Judas* was not chosen by Lot as *Matthias* was.

Tho' I know not what you mean by [setting up that in Kingdom counterfeit] nor how men should understand that by [Semi-Sadduces of the Apostacy] you meant no body, but an Abstract Thing; yet I understand and accept your Retraction.

Page 5. Your [bold avouching] speaketh your confidence, but is no help to convince another, that a Kingdom of One day (1000 years) ascribed to Christ, doth honour him more than an Endless Kingdom of Glory after two thousand (or six thousand) years Kingdom of Grace.

2. I thank you for disclaiming the Doctrines which your words did favour: And intreat you that are so accurate in Prophecy, hereafter to be more accurate in your words, and to speak as you think, and as you would have others think, that understand words according to common usage.

Page 6. Of your commendations of Dr. *Crispe's* Book, I think so ill, that I have written a proper Answer to you about it, but stop the publishing of it, because I find you so ready to retract. But I confess your commending to the World, a Book so contrary to Christianity it self, doth much abate my reverence to your confidence in Prophecy.

If such as Dr. *Crispe* and you have no safer and sounder words to Preach Justification and Grace by, than to tell men how bad it is to think that sin can possibly do them any hurt, or duty, or any thing they can do (Faith, Hope, Love, Obedience) do them any good, and to tell them that Christ is the greatest hater of God, Murderer, Adulterer, &c. in the World, and that not only the punishment (and guilt of punishment) but the very sins themselves of all the Elect are Christ's own sins; and that if men commit Murder, Adultery, Perjury, Treason, it is none of their sin but Christ's, for it cannot be Christ's and theirs too; they are for all the acts, no Murderers, no Adulterers, no Traitors, no Haters of God, &c. I say, if this be your excellent Preaching of Christ and his Kingdom, I shall not admire your Doctrine of the Kingdom; nor wonder if more of this Doctor's Disciples be like that one, that would come drunk and kneel to prayer in in his Family, and cry, [Lord, all our righteousness is not worth twopence, no, Lord, it is not worth a half-penny.] And I hope hereafter you will speak more intelligibly of our Justification only by God's Essential Righteousness.

To

To pag. 7, 8. The Kingdom of Grace, which you confess is not another, but the same that extendeth to the endless Kingdom of Glory, by degrees destroying Sin and Curse, and putting down Enemies, and by the Triumphant appearing of Christ at the Resurrection finishing the Reign of Deliverance, Conquest and Acquisition, and entering on the Reign of his Reward and glorious Fruition: There being in Scripture no mention that I can find of any Thousand years between these two.

I come to your four professed Differences.

I. That there is, besides all the Kingly State of Christ wherein we are agreed, a distinct Kingdom of Jesus Christ as the great Son of Man, to the highest Noon tide Glory of which God hath assigned a Thousand years: And when it hath utterly subdued all Enemies, it is to be delivered up to God, and the Father, and the Son, to be subject in that very sense.

Ans. I have recited all your words, that I may be sure that I leave not out the specifick difference: But what it is I am never the wiser, nor know by these words. I had the unhappiness from my Youth to be inclined to strict definition and distinction, and accurate Logical Explications, and to abhor confused Harangues; and therefore the (now despised) Schoolmen were my pleasant study, next to the Bible and practical Divinity. But now I have lived to see that kind of study and disputing derided, (which is far easier than learned) and to hear Disputes about Terms unexplained; and the Question debated in the beginning, and scarce stated in the end.

Which of these words specifies the middle Kingdom from the former and the latter? Or must it be none of the particulars, but all connext?

1. Is it the word [distinct?] That's but to beg the Question, which is, whether there be any middle distinct Kingdom? And it tells us not what it is. A distinction in the exercise of administration between the beginning and resignation we are agreed of.

2. Is the difference in the word [The Great Son of Man?] Is he not the Great Son of Man before and after?

3. Is it in [the highest Noon tide Glory?] Will it be greater than the Glory after the Thousand years?

4. Is it in the time of [1000 years?] Is the time the species of the Kingdom? And is a Thousand years better than everlasting?

5. Is

5. Is it in [*the subduing of all Enemies*] Mean you *in fieri*, or *in facto esse*? If the first, Is he not subduing them now? Doth he not subdue them in every sanctified Soul? and did he not subdue the Grand Pagan Roman Empire, &c. If you mean *in facto esse*, as consummate, then what needs a Thousand years to do it, when the Resurrection is the finishing of it?

6. Is the delivering up to the Father, the specifying form? then it is not in being till it is past being. How can it be delivered up before it is in being? And then the previous Kingdom of Acquisition and Conquest is the same, for that is delivered to the Father.

7. Is it [*the Son's being subject in that very sense*?] Little know I what you mean by [*that very sense*] But I know that the Son as Man was, and will be subject: In the former and the everlasting Kingdom. And so here is not one syllable of the specifick difference, but a harangue of words.

As to the *Taking of God's Name in vain*, I beseech you to fear it. To father a falshood on God is dangerous. Suspension is safer, where you say that to *diminish is equally dangerous*.] Therefore I do it not: I do not say, that God tells us that there is no such Millenary Kingdom; but only that I can find no proof of any such, and therefore tell you what hindereth me from your confident Opinion.

To pag. 10. It's very true that you say, that there is needful a comprehensive knowledge of the whole frame of Prophecy and Chronology to a clear Judgment of many hard points: But not to the suspension of Judgment, nor to the confutation of every Error.

And I believe that you have studied Chronology, and *Daniel* and *Ezekiel* more than I have done: But should I enter into a dispute with your pretended Scripture Chronology, and object against you, all that I find in *Usher*, *Helvicus*, *Petavius*, *Beroaldus*, *Jos. Scaliger*, *Carion*, *Bucholzer*, *Funstin*, *Gutherleth*, *Micrelins*, *Mr. Talents*, &c. how endless would be the dispute? And yet must your Chronology and all its consequents be taken for granted Truths?

3. You truly say, that our Infancy, that needs to be fed with Milk, maketh us less capable of these Mysteries. The Lord pity and reach us. But I must say, that the Ministers and People that have most need of Milk, (but least feel their need) are most

most inclined to your Opinion in this point; excepting a few Learned men (*Mr. Mead*, and *Dr. Twisse*, and *Dr. Moore*, &c.) whom he overcame.

Ad pag. 11. 1. Call it a distinct Kingdom, or a distinct part of the administration, as you please, we grant that the glorious appearance of Christ to Judgment is distinct from his invisible Reign in Heaven. As the Assizes is a distinct exercise of Judicature, and as Triumph is distinct from Conquest. As it is the Triumphant end of Christ's Conquests, and the beginning of his Rewarding Kingdom of Glory, it is oft spoken of in Scripture. But of what more I expect your proof.

But here you pretend a description of this Kingdom; but no other than before, *sine differentia specificâ*.

1. It is a Supreme Oeconomy; and was not that before and after Supreme?

2. It was towards the Family in Heaven and Earth.] So was that before and after.

3. It was in the fulness of all times.] Sure then it was after your Thousand years.

4. It was by the Great Son of Man and Lamb.] So it was before and will be after.

5. The Humanity shall have a Glory singular to it self, as it had a Humiliation.] True, but not divided from the Godhead; and so it had before, and will have to eternity, as you confess.

Is this Elucidation, or an informing way of an Instructor?

But you say, The Rain-bow is a symbol of it. This obscure Information, I like not your name of [*it's Glory distinct and distant from the Sun*.] The Glory of Christ's Humanity is distinct, but not distant from the Deity; and it is as near before and after, and as glorious as you can justly imagine it to be in the Thousand years.

Pag. 12. A Kingdom confined to a Thousand years you affirm indeed, but without a word of proof. 2. You add seventy five years and some time after the Thousand, I would you had designed to tell us what you mean by its [*Succession*] and what by its [*Investiture*] whether the *Succession* be before or after the Conflagration, and any part of the Kingdom: Or if only a preparation what that Church-state of preparation is?

Pag. 13. Gog and Magog you say, [*Are Satan and all the wicked, that had been Raised to lie at the footstool of Christ from the*

the very beginning of the Thousand years] being loosed, Take to make a bold attempt on the holy City to draw it to defection.] Is this Christ's Gospel or yours?

Qu. 1. Are these dead raised men invisible bodies, or only as Devils invisible spirits, or in bodies invisible?

Qu. 2. Rev. 20. saith, that Satan deceiveth the Nations, to gather them against the holy City: But if they were Devils themselves that do it as other Devils in malice, what need they a Satan to deceive them?

Qu. 3. Rev. 20. saith, They were the Nations that were in the Earth: Were all the dead wicked raised, dwellers on Earth in the Thousand years?

Qu. 4. If they had bodies, where will there be room on Earth for all the wicked since Cain till the end, to dwell there all at once?

Qu. 5. And would there be room for them all so near the holy City?

Qu. 6. When the Text saith, Satan deceived them to gather them to Battle; why turn you [Battle] to [drawing the City to defection?]

Qu. 7. Where were all these Dead Raised men when the Earth was on fire? If, in another World, how come they after to be dwellers in the New Paradise Earth? If they were on Earth, were they raised before, or in, or after the burning? And how scape their new bodies? The Paradise Saints have bodies of flesh, passible, and such as must have food: Sure all the raised wicked have not bodies less sensible, patible, or that need less food.

Qu. 8. Is not the New City and Earth after a Thousand years experience, worse than weak Christians are now? If by known Devils, and condemned wicked ones of all Ages raised, they will be drawn from Christ, after a Thousand years Miracles?

Qu. 9. What becometh of the bodies of all the wicked that are found alive at the Conflagration? Do they scape out of the fire also as the Saints do? And doth the New Earth at once hold all the Saints that were alive, and all the wicked alive, and all the wicked dead from Cain's time?

Qu. 10. And is that the New Earth wherein dwelleth Righteousness, that hath so many wicked?

Q. 11.

Qu. 11. If Grace cannot now be lost, will not Christ then keep his Paradise Saints?

Qu. 12. Or if the New Earth fall away, did not the holy City consist most of Hypocrites? and is that the Glory of it? We are now in surer keeping than Adam and the fallen Angels were. None shall take us out of Christ's hands.

Qu. 13. Doth not this leave us to fear that those in the New Heaven also may fall away as the Angels did?

Qu. 14. For will there not (after the Seventy five years preparation) be as good people found on Earth, as those that died before? Why then think you that those alive shall be set so far below the rest, as to have but an earthly generating life, when the rest are in Heaven? And Christ saith, *The last shall be first, and the first last.*

Qu. 15. Why say you that the Laodicean Apostasie is no greater a wonder than Adams and the Angels? Is the New World in no better a state? Then the New Jerusalem may become Devils.

Qu. 16. You say, *Christ being to put an end to a Church-state on Earth, may suffer so just an occasion for spewing out of his mouth.* But do you honour or dishonour the Glorious Kingdom, to feign it to have such an end? That lasting but one day (a Thousand years) it should end in being spewed out for ever?

Qu. 17. What Word of God have you for your Opinion, that there shall never more be an Earth, or a Church on Earth? And that God who is delighted in his wondrous works, will have none of these Worlds, from eternity to eternity, but only for seven days (seven Thousand years?)

Qu. 18. Peter tells us of the burning of the Earth, but not of the ending of it: How come you to know so much more than he ever intimated or seemed to know?

Qu. 19. To say that Heaven and Earth have so unhappy an end, doth it not tempt men to Manicheising, to think that an ill God made this world?

Qu. 20. Did not something within you reluctate when you cited 2 Per. 3. for the Thousand years duration of the Kingdom? As if you argued [Peter tells the unbelievers, Delay of Christ's coming should not make you think that he will not come: For a Thousand years delay is with God but as a year: Ergo his Kingdom will be but a Thousand years.] Is this to expound Prophecy?

Qu. 21.

Qu. 21. Is it more faulty in a *Plato, Zeno*, or other Pagans to conjecture at Transmigrations of Souls, revolutions of Worlds, or with *Aristotle*, to think the World was an eternal Effect of an eternal Cause: Or for a Christian to say, *Thus saith the Lord*, and pawn God's Word for his erroneous conjectures.

Your Arguments are too long and loose for any Mood, and Figure, or Reason.

Arg. 1. *King of Kings* is a Title fit for a great Kingdom, &c. What then? *Ergo* it proveth a Middle Kingdom between that of Recovering Grace, and Resurrection Glory.) I deny the consequence; no Kingdom is fitter for those Titles than that of Grace and final Glory. This is not proving.

It's false that Christ hath not yet been an Universal Monarch.

Pag. 15. Your 2d Argument (as the rest) is but a repeating of your own formally confuted Opinions, without any reply to the Confutation, as if you had nothing to do, but assert again what you think.

1 Cor. 15. 24. Is your proof, *Then cometh the end*? And is the Thousand years the end, and not the Glorious Kingdom of fruition? Judgment will end by Triumph the Kingdom of Acquisition: But the eternal Kingdom will be the last.

2. Your denial of a *Distinct Glory of Christ's Humanity before and after the Thousand years*, is certainly untrue. If the Divine and Humane Nature be distinct, the Glory of each must needs be distinct, tho' not divided. Why obtrude you gross things unproved?

3. Your intimation that *God doth then begin to be All in All, and Christ to be Subject, in some special sense*, hath no proof from the Text, nor if proved is it any thing for your purpose.

1. The Text speaks of no such beginning: But that though Christ hath done his Conquering work, yet *still God shall be All in All things, as he was*.

2. Yet we grant that it speaks of Christ's ending his Kingdom of Conquest and Acquisition, and the Deity now Governing Man as restored, not needing any more recovery. I oft tell you, as the King's Son made General to reduce Rebels, giveth up his Generalship when he hath reduced them, but hath after the promised honour and reward, but as a Subject still, & not a Captain.

Pag. 16. You say, that our Exposition chargeth on the Apostle *Impropriety of speech* but you do but say so, and we deny it. Is it not proper speech to say, that a General giveth up his Office, and

and yet remaineth an honoured, rewarded Subject Ruler?] Indeed, had it been as you feign it, said [*to become subject*] it would have seemed to signify, that he then began to be subject: But that's your addition; & yet you before confess that he was subject before.

2. I told you *Distinguishing* is not *Separating*. And I told you wherein the difference consisteth, which you confute not.

3. To your 2d Reason, I find no such Scripture as you talk of, that mentioneth any middle Kingdom, but a Triumphant Judgment perfecting the Kingdom of Grace, and beginning that of Endless Glory. The *admirable agreement* which you mention seemeth to me to be but an agreement of *your conceits*.

Your 3d Argument from *Luk. 22. 29, 30.* saith nothing of a third Kingdom: All that is there said seemeth to me fulfilled without a third.

Pag. 17. Is not that you plead for [*of the Humane Nature as united to the Eternal Word*?] How can it else be any Kingdom of Christ? But both that of Grace and Glory are such, but not without the Relation of *Mediatorship*. By [*Constituted*] I suppose you mean, not essential to the nature or person, without respect to the Office as the product of God's VVill: And such is the *Everlasting Kingdom*. It is the Reign of the Man Jesus united to the God-head, as Mediator of Acquisition first, and then of *Fruition*, and this over creatures. I fear it is dangerously untrue therefore that you say, *That the Kingdom of the Humane Nature is united to the Eternal Word, and communicating with it, is an Essential, and not a Constitutive Kingdom*.

Essential to what? Is the *Humane Nature*, and a World of *Creatures essential to God*? It is essential to it self; that is, it is what it is. But can you prove that the Humane Nature was, or shall ever be united to the Deity, without its Relation of Mediator? It is Christ's will, that *those given him be with him, and see his Glory*: And that sight is of the Mediator of *Fruition*; and did he limit that sight to a Thousand years?

To your 2d. 1. You have not proved that the Apostles yet sit not on Thrones of Judgment: They are equal with Angels.

2. If yet they do not, ~~may it not be at~~ Judgment, and in the Kingdom of Glory?

3. The Title of [*His Kingdom, and eating and drinking*] are as fully answered without the middle Kingdom as with it; unless you can prove that those Apostles with Christ, shall dwell, and eat

and drink a Thousand years on Earth, in their spiritual bodies, or have a middle sort of bodies for that middle Kingdom; and had they not better before, and must they lay those by for worse?

Arg. 4. You know we deny not that *Christ's Throne is distinguished from his Fathers*: You cite the Text, *Rev. 3. 21. [He overcame and is set down]* and expounded it *[He knew he should sit, but was not yet set down]* not indeed in the Throne of Triumph and of Glory, till he overcame.]

You say, *[It cannot be a Throne he hath yet]* what! when it is said, *He is set down on it?* But *Saints must sit with him*, you say: And may not he sit down before them? Must he stay till every Saint be with him?

You say again, *It cannot be the Throne of Eternity, because the Son is subject, and hath not a distinct Throne, &c.*

Ans. If you mean by the Throne of Eternity] a Kingdom from Eternity: There could be no such thing, unless there were Eternal Subjects. If you mean only *[To Eternity]* the Son will have a distinct, but not a separate Throne, tho' not distinct Subjects. For he shall subordinely have all power in Heaven and Earth.

P. 18. Arg. 5. Mat. 20. 20. You say, *This is not the Kingdom of the Eternal Word.* *Ans.* Then it can be no Kingdom of Christ.

You say, *[There is no sitting on the right hand or left.] Ans.* Nor no Subjects from Eternity, unless the World be eternal. But *10. Eternity* there is.

You say, *He that sits on the left hand, must sit next the Father.* *Ans.* This is your way of arguing by Allegories? You are not an Anthropomorphite: You know that by God's right hand, is but to be next him in Power, subordinate. And may not others be next to Christ?

Arg. 6. You say is from innumerable Scriptures: *Mat. 19. 27.* is before spoken to; who doubteth but the Throne of his Glory was future. *Mat. 25. 31.* confuteth you. You say, *It's not to be till all be gathered before him to Judgment.* *Ans.* Therefore not a Thousand years before those alive be gathered before him to Judgment. Christ speaketh of coming to Judge all (not some) to everlasting life or punishment; but nothing of a Thousand years.

Page 19. 2 Tim. 4. 1. We doubt not of his Judgment or Kingdom: But what word is here of some middle Kingdom?

Luke 19. 11. Christ went to receive a Kingdom; and did he receive none till his return at the Resurrection? what can be plainer against

against you: He ascended to be presently possessor of a greater Possession of Power: All Power in Heaven and Earth was given him before his Return.

You say, *This is not the State of the Kingdom where God shall be All in All.* *Ans.* These are but your own words often answered and confuted.

From Mat. 16. 26, 27. One would think that it should be a good Argument that Christ shall have one Kingdom, that was first obscured by flesh's weakness, after come in visible Power to Judgment, and pass into Glory, because some then alive should see the pledge and appearance of it. But you hence gather, that because men shall see the appearance of his heavenly Glorious Reign, therefore he shall have none of that Reign in the Kingdom of Grace or Endless Glory, but in a third and middle Kingdom; such Collections expound your self, more than the Text.

As soon as Christ ascended to Heaven, he was possessor of the Kingdom of Power, seen in the Mount, and not only at the Millennium.

P. 20. Arg. 6. You fetch your most conclusive Argument from the one single note by which the Spirit of God hath fixed the beginning of this Kingdom, that is, *The subduing of Enemies* where your fantastic maketh two degrees. 1. The making of Christ's Enemies his footstool. And 2. Putting them Low under his feet. As if his footstool were not low and under his feet. Can you prove that Scripture meaneth this as two States, and that at 1000 years distance? Yes, you say the second is to bring them to the state of no motion or action: And yet are they haters of God, and have they a self-tormenting Conscience, and when loosed are Gog and Magog; and assault the holy City; and yet have no motion or action? I suppose that in your next you will say you meant well, and not that they were made dead blocks or annihilated; but you should speak as you think, or say that you think as you speak. It will comfort the wicked to hope that they shall have only the punishment of Lo's as dead insensible carcases. You have many passages of this sound.

Page 21. You grossly pervert *Psal. 110. 1.* God saith not, *Sit thou without Reigning at my right hand, till I call at once, or at the last make thine Enemies thy footstool.* He saith not, *Sit without Reigning, and Reign only at thy last coming*: But *fit* next me in Royal dignity while I am making thine Enemies thy footstool, which at last shall be perfected: What word saith as you; I intend thee a Great and distinct Kingdom (of one days length) the date of its beginning shall not be at thy Ascension, &c. Did not God make the Pagan Empire his footstool, and subdue Sin and Satan, till the day of Judgment? It is enough that all will be then finished and the Kingdom of Glory begun. *[He sits and doth not Reign]* is your fiction against full Scripture.

Heb. 2. 5. We see them not put under him can mean but *[We see not that subjection perfected.]* But we do see them put under him in a great degree. The Lord reigneth; Let the people rejoice. The Kingdoms of the World are made the Kingdoms of the Lord and of his Christ before the day of Judgment.

If we see not all things put under him, do we see nothing so put? When Judgment puts all things under him, what need a Thousand years do it?

The pag. 22d is but the repetition of what is oft answered.

P. 23. It's a great disparagement to your Cause, to lay your chief *suasion* on this Text: As if it were not fulfilled by Christ many 100 or 1000 years treading down Sin, Satan, and Empire of Enemies, and triumphing over them at his Glorious appearing, and Reigning for ever for that Conquest in Glory, unless he be a Thousand years more between in Conquering them.

As to 2 Pet. 3. 7. I askt you before whether you feel no reluctance in so gross an abuse of that Text that speaketh of 1000 delay being before Christ's coming, as if it spake of 1000 years after. Pardon the Question: The Cause requireth it.

P. 34. You have but one Text in all the Bible that speaks of 1000 years to give you the least shew of Countenance; and that in Prophetic Language: And can you not say *out* he mentioning of it? What else should all your Book have been, but your clearing of this one Text: You promise to prove abundantly that it cannot possibly be understood of any time past: But I see no hope of your performance.

I once more intreat the Reader to read *John Fox his Oath of what God from Heaven revealed to him to the contrary Martyrol*, Vol. 1. p. 111. and in his *Lat. Expof. of the Revelations*, even that *John Fox* who was no Papist, and thought Propheticall, when he told Mrs. *Honwood* despairing in Melancholy how she should recover and live to be old, when in unbelief she threw a Glass to the Wall or Ground, and took it up whole, and fulfilled his Prophecie.

But you have fitted the rest of your Exposition to your Exposition of the 1000 years, and then you think that fitness proveth all your Point. But if I shew that all these Texts were performed on Pagan Rome, it is not your finding Pagan Rome to be like it, that will justify your sense.

It were an impertinent work to shew here that the Revelation hath a far different sense, from what you give it.

Page 27. Your 2d Point therefore is of another Controversie, which this in hand depending not on; unless you confess that you have no other proof of the Thousand years Kingdom, but Rev. 20. and that it was not fulfilled heretofore. I am past doubt that Pagan Rome was Babylon mentioned in Rev. But whether Pagan Rome be another Babylon, I leave to enquiry: But if all your Cause lie on that one Text, I think it hath no good foundation. Many Expositors think those Thousand years long ago past, as well as *John Fox*, *Grotius* and *Hammond*. I am sure they are before the War of Gog and Magog, and you must say more yet before you can make me believe that this is another World, by all the wicked dead and raised.

I have by me an Answer to all your Arguments on this Subject, and more, not here to be repeated. Tho' your confidence by the advantage of prejudice, may seem to many to justify all your heavy charges on the (true) Opinion, that the Thousand years there mentioned are past.

Page 38. I find all assertive, and the repetition of what you have formerly said, without true Argument or Answer.

Arg. 1. Is it not the Eternal Word in our Nature, Mediator, that is the Son of Man, and Christ our Lord? What a distinction is here!

Arg. 2. Isa. 66 speaks of the Carcasses of the Syrians.

The Saints shall to Eternity be united to Christ in our Nature.

Arg. 3. I am sorry that a third time you so abuse Peter's Thousand years against the plain Text.

Page 39. Arg. 4. The New Heaven and Earth is chap. 21. mentioned as after Gog and Magog's destruction, and the time of Judgment: And you make it 1000 years before. If it was before, it rather seemeth to mean the New State of the Church as prefiguring the heavenly Glory.

Assert.

Assert. 2. Arg. 1. The Kingdom of Christ shall never cease as Glorious in Fruition, but only as Victorious in Acquisition.

Arg. 2. 1. The Text speaketh of the Old Earth and Heaven flying away, and you feign it to speak of the New. 2. New and Old, and all things are in the Divine Immensity: How then doth that make the difference? 3. That no other shall succeed, is but your word, if you had proved that it is the New that shall fly away.

Arg. 3. Is but repetition. I believe you not that there shall be no use of a Material Heaven and Earth: Nor that the Humane Nature of Christ shall not be the Object that Saints shall look upon, and yet shall be the Medium of Conveyance. Doth not Christ say, *It is his will that we shall be with him to see his Glory?* Shall it not be an Object, if a Medium? Let us not feign our selves higher than God hath promised. If we be not the highest creatures, why should we think that we have not need of higher? Is all our promised Comfort in Communion with the Angels, Saints, and Christ's Humanity objectively confined to a Thousand years?

Page 41. Obj. 1. How prove you that God's everlasting Communication to Humane Nature is not as free as the rest, seeing he freely created and continueth Humane Nature?

2. Is not all Time in Eternity? And doth all Time end before all temporary creatures end? You may as well call one an Economy as the other.

Page 42. Is there no Glory to Eternity but what is from Eternity? Then either Christ's Humane Nature, and all his Saints were from Eternity, or else they will not be to Eternity.

Arg. 4. That there shall be no use of the New Heaven or Earth for Saints of the first Resurrection above, seemeth contrary to the whole scope of Scriptures.

Christ's Humane Nature and ours, had no Glory with the Father before any World began. For that which existed not had no Glory.

Page 43. Propos. 3. The spiritual heavenly Bodies will be apparent forever; shall they not know and be known even as face to face?

Prop. 4. You answer not what is bid to prove that there is no Thousand year: between the Changing and the taking up.

Your Reasons are formerly answered.

Page 44. Prop. 5. Lot was carried out of Sodom, but you hold that the Living shall be in the fire, and not caught out: That they shall be in it unburnt, you do not prove. Peter doth not speak of keeping them in the fire unburnt.

Page 45. If the Saints changed are to be numbred with the Children of the Resurrection, they neither marry, nor are given in marriage. And you say, They be to make but one New Jerusalem.

Prop. 7. Tell us your proof of three or four sorts of our Bodies: That the Earthly Body shall be turned into a Paradise Body, and that into a Spiritual Body, if not that also into a *supra-celestial*.

Prop. 8. I have proved that the taking up is at the sound of the Trumpet, which is the time of the Resurrection.

Page 46. If all be One Resurrection, then those in Paradise are Children of the Resurrection, and marry not.

Point 4. Of the Jews Restauration, you are pleased to leave almost all unanswered that I brought against you, and so discharge me from any Reply: Though you say, that your words answer all material Objections, being themselves what I did before invalidate.

In the conclusion to all my former Questions, I desire your Answer to these few more added;

Q. 1. Seeing pag. 5. You dare not think of any World before that, Gen. 1. nor after the Kingdom given up, &c. what mean you by the Eternal Kingdom, when there are no Eternal Subjects?

Q. 1.

Q. 2. If it be all the wicked that died before the Trumpet, that are Raised, and after assault the New Jerusalem, have they not mostly been bound many Thousand years already, in that they assault us no more, unless you take them to be the Devils that tempt us?

Q. 3. Will their punishment all the Thousand years be so easie as to allow them to cover the Earth & fight against the Saints? and will it no more convince them?

Q. 4. What became of their Bodies in the Conflagration?

Q. 5. And of the Bodies of all the living wicked?

Q. 6. And of their Souls that lived then in wickedness?

Q. 7. Seeing you take *Philadelphia* to be the New Earth in its purity, before its fall, can you believe that in that World, there is but a little strength, and that there is a Synagogue of Satan called Jews, that must come and worship before their feet? And that *Philadelphia* after the fire, is yet to be kept from an hour of temptation that shall come on all the World, to try them that dwell on the Earth?

Q. 8. Doth the New Paradise World hear, Behold I come quickly hold fast, &c after Christ is come?

Q. 9. Seeing *Laodicea* is also with you the New Earth and Paradise State, is that indeed a Changel State, and World of Righteousness in which the New Jerusalem is neither hot nor cold, and to be spewed out, and is wretched, and miserable, and poor, and blind, and naked, and knoweth it not, but saith, I want nothing, and is yet counselled to buy, and cover her shame, &c. Is that World no better than so?

Q. 10. Doth God reward all men according to their works, if the Best Saints found alive are for a thousand years in no better a World, and the Worst Saints that were dead since *Abel* till Christ's coming, are in a spiritual higher Body and Region all that Thousand years? Is this God's Word?

Q. 11. Did any of the Asian Churches, or any Christians for 1300 years at least (or 1500) believe that the five first Epistles were written to men of this World, and the two last to the men of the World to come after the Earth (and Bibles) are burnt?

Q. 12. Consider whether you that so zealously cry down the Papal Antichrist and Babylon, do not ignorantly maintain the Papal State which you call Antichristian? What is the Essence of Papacy, but the claim of an Universal Power over the Church, in the Pope, or his Counsel, he being the Head. And do not you maintain that the Seven Churches are Seven States of the Church Universal? And almost all Expositors agree that by the Angel is meant the Bishop, at least, as *Bzæ* saith, the *Proector* with his Elders: And have even the Two Churches of the World to come such an Universal Government? Sure then it is of Divine Institution that such there be: And who claimeth it but the Pope and Councils? This is the Effect of over-doing Zeal.

For my part, if I believed that by God's Institution the Church Catholick must have one Universal Humane Angel or Government, Monarchical or Aristocratical, or mixt, I would presently be a Papist.

Sir; If any words in this Paper are displeasing to you for their freedom, be assured it is to your Words and Cause, and not for want of Love and great Esteem of your Person; who as you are by Birth above me (the Son of a Godly Knight) so from my heart I believe that you are a far better man than my self. And though I think you over-confident of your Apprehensions, I love you the better while I think, How strong a Faith hath that good man of God's Word in general, who is so confident in every hard particular. I beg your prayers for me, who look from day to day, when fight resolveth me of all these Controversies.

Postscript.

Postscript.

§ 1. I Understand that on further thoughts, some men that are further from me, than Mr. *Beverly*, are like by his Book, to be much confirmed against Christianity.

Their Judgment of Christ is much like the Turks, That there is One God, and *Jesus* is one of his three great Legislator-Prophets, and to be called his Son, because of his miraculous Generation: But that as Incarnate and the Son of Man he hath but a Temporal Kingdom, and that Humanity shall at the end of the Thousand years be put off, and with the Kingdom delivered up to the Father, shall cease; and that God's being All in All implieth this cessation.

Because Mr. *Beverley* taketh himself not accountable for other mens Errours, and seemeth himself to renounce all such, I will speak to them my self, (and to him on the by,) first, desiring him to have so much charity to such men, as to undeceive them by explaining these few particulars of his.

§ 2. 1. To tell them what he meaneth by his distinction of *Christ's Nature and Kingdom as Man in our Nature, and his Nature and Kingdom as the Son of Man*, which he thinks ends with the Millennium. To tell them what he meaneth by *Christ's Humane Nature* before the Incarnation. If it be the *Natura Mentalis* in genere, is it not as much an Angelical Nature as a Humane? And he was not *Jesus Christ* the Anointed Saviour from Eternity, nor before he was here Incarnate of *Mary*. If his Body and Humane Soul then received, die or cease, then *Jesus Christ* dieth or ceaseth, though the Mental Nature Humane or Angelical cease not: Leave us not to the equivocal of a continued [*Humane* or *our Nature*] while you distinguish [*Christ Man*] from [*Christ the Son of Man*]. But tell us whether it be only a Spiritual Mentality, superangelical, or the Soul and Body of a Man at his Incarnation. If it be the *Anima Mundi*, is it not the Common Nature of all things?

C

2. To

2. To tell them yet what he meaneth by the *Kingdom of Eternity* as distinct from the *Thousand years Kingdom*; seeing he denieth that there were any *Subjects*, or *Creatures* from *Eternity*, what is that *Kingdom* that hath no *Subjects*, nor *Government*? If he mean only [*To Eternity*,] of that anon.

3. To tell us also how it can be that Christ should continue in our Nature, and yet be no *Object* of our Souls, but only a Conveying Medium.

§ 3. Now I desire both him and these others that misuse him, to consider as followeth.

I. Is there any Scripture that saith, that Christ had two *Humane Natures*?

II. *Cessation* is no less than *Death*, or *Transmutation* into some other Nature. If Christ's *Incarnate Humanity* Die, how is he called *Immortal*, *Eternal*, and said to bring *Life and Immortality to light*, his *Kingdom to have no end*, as the slain Lamb, to be dead and alive for evermore; to have the power or *Keys of Life, and Death, and Hell, &c.*

If it be *Transmutation*, it is either of his *Humane, Specifick Form*: And then into what other Form, Nature or Being is he changed? It is but the perfecting of the *Humane Form* which he had, by turning corruptible flesh and blood into a spiritual glorious body: And this was done before at his *Ascension*. And this we deny not, to be eternal as to come. If this be your *swallowing up*.]

III. If we shall have the same *Humane Nature* [*in specie* spiritualized and glorified after the *Thousand years* that we had before, so shall Christ; for he will make our *Vile Bodies* like to his *Glorious Body*. But many Promises assure us of such a continuance: Else we shall be no *Men*, but *Nothing*, or some thing of another *species*. And Christ calleth us *Brethren and Co-heirs*.

IV. If Christ will be the *Head* of the *Glorified Church* after the *Thousand years*, then certainly there will be a *Unity of Humane Nature*, and an everlasting *Communion* both as with a *Cause Efficient, Objective and Final*. And it cannot be true which you say (and the Infidels will take hold of) that Christ as *Man* in our Nature will not be an *Object* (even of Fruition. For we shall still be *Individual Members* of a *Political Body*: And shall we have a *Head*, and *King*, and not know him,

him, and not Love him, and not Praise or Honour him? Shall the Saints praise of the Lamb, that Redeemed them, cease then for ever? Shall we all then cease to be *Kings and Priests*, and to sit with him on his *Throne*, and to sing the song of the Lamb, and to see him as he is, and face to face, and to behold his *Glory* given him as *Man*? Is he in all this no *Object*? And how oft doth Scripture make him the *Final Object* under the *finis ultimus ultimus*, as he is to be glorified? Shall an *Intelligent Head* and *Members* live together, and neither know, nor love, nor rejoice in each other?

V. Shall the whole *Heavenly City, Society and Chore*; be dissolved for ever? If so, do not the *Mahometans* hope for a better felicity than such, who think *Mahomet* will for longer time than a *Thousand years* give them their desires, and that his *Kingdom* shall not end by being spewed out finally in everlasting disgrace?

But if the *Body and City* continue, so will the *Head and King*. And will Christ's *Incarnate Humanity* spiritualized be for ever useless? Will he live for nothing? *Heaven and Angels* will not be useless: God shall shine in them, and we shall see that light. Shall it be our joy to sit with *Abraham, Isaac and Jacob*, and to enter into the Joy of our Lord, and this all cease, and the Deity only be an *Object* after a *Thousand years*? O short everlastingness!

VI. Open your Eyes, and see your Contradiction, that think Christ's *Kingdom* (as the Son of Man) shall for ever cease, and yet that Christ shall be subject to the Father. Shall He be subject as God, or as Man? Not as God, for God is not subject to himself: If as the Son of Man, then that *Manhood* continueth in being: And doubtless in a *Glorious Objective and Effective Being*.

VII. But speaking to men inclined to believe that Christ shall be no Christ after the *Thousand years*, I will deal with them according to their Principles; and argue from *Natural Order*, and from *Oeconomical or Instituted*.

Do you not believe that God hath *Creatures* of divers ranks, some above others in excellency and causality? No wonder that he that believeth not any *Creatures* continuance, believeth not Christ's: Or he that believeth not that one is above others in operation, believeth not the continuance of Christ's Power.

Do you think that God worketh by *any second Causes* (though he be himself never the further from the Effect, nor less in the Causality ?) Doth he not enlighten, warm and quicken earthly Creatures by the *Sun* ? and govern *Men* by *Angels*, and *Subjects* by *Princes*, and *Beasts* by *Men* ? Certainly if the *World* cease not, this Natural Order of Creatures and Causes will not cease. None but mad-men, I think, will doubt that Angels and Devils have Rule and Inferiority.

And if so, after the Thousand years *some prime Creature* must be a *Superior Cause* of operation to the rest, and that according to the *Nature* of each, and therefore *to Man*, that is, *Intellectual, Volitive, Affectionate* and *Active*. And what Creature is this ? Why may you not grant it to Christ, as well as to any other ? Will you say with *Aristotle*, It is the first or highest Orb ? That Orb then must be a Spirit : And what Spirit befall Christ the First and Last ? If his Humanity cease, shall *Angels* cease too ? Or shall they be advanced so far above *Christ* as a *Creature*, as to Reign under God for ever when Christ is deposed or extinct ?

Obj. *He is not deposed, but his Created Nature will be swallowed up in the Deity.*

Ans. Intelligible sense is swallowed up in such insignificant Metaphors. Is the Humane Nature turned into the Divine, and a Creature made the Godhead it self ? If not, what can you mean but *Extinction* or *Annihilation* ?

Obj. *But there was no use for a Mediator before the Fall, and after there will be none after.*

Ans. There was no use for his *Recovering Government*; and there will be none in perfect Glory : But there will be use for Christ's and his Body's glorious Fruition, and felicitating work, as the state of Reward : There was no use for us before we had our Being ; and yet we may have everlasting life.

Obj. *But the Kingdom it self, and not only the Modus Regendi, will be given up, and Christ Subject and God all in all. And you say, the Kingdom continueth, and make two Kingdoms, when Scripture maketh but one.*

Ans. Is the Question *de Nomine*, or *de Re* ? If *de Nomine* only, take your liberty to call it *One*, or *Two*, or *Three* : If *de Re*, are not these *real differences* ? 1. Between the *Genus* or *Species Superior*, and the *Species Inferior* or *Specialissima* : For in each

each *sense* is the word [*the Kingdom of God, Christ's Heaven*] oft taken in Scripture.

2. Between the Governing of men as an *Army*, a *School*, a *Hospital*, the Governing them as *meer Subjects* (healed, taught, subdued.) 1. The state of the Subjects is not the same 2. The Relation of the Ruler is not the same (a Captain, a Physician, and a Viceroy.) 3. The *finis Relationis* is not the same. 4. All the persons are not the same (for Conquest destroyeth some Rebels.) 5. The Laws are not the same. 6. The Execution is not the same.

What is it then that you would have ? Is it that Christ as a Creature shall cease ? Or that he shall have no power under the Deity ? Who shall have it then ? Doth not Scripture set him above Angels ? Are they not his Ministers ? What Creature shall be over Christ ? To say, There shall be no Kingdom, is to say, There shall be no God. To say, There shall be no Government under God as second Causes, is to say, There shall be no World.

Obj. *But why call you it two Kingdoms ?*

Ans. Because Scripture and all Divines do so. *The Kingdom is taken from the Jews, and given to another Nation. The Kingdoms of the World are become the Kingdoms of Christ*] And many such Texts, speak not of the Kingdom of endless glory.

Obj. *But after the Resurrection and Thousand years there will be no Legislation, no Judgment, no Execution ; therefore no Kingdom of Christ.*

Ans. You may as well say, [*No Kingdom of God,*] for you infer that or nothing. But a *Law* is nothing but the *notification of the Rulers will to the Subject* : And will not God make it our *Duty* to love and praise him ? His face, yea and the face of Christ, will be a *Law*, or notification of our duty. Cannot God govern us by a perfect *Law of Nature* and *Intuition* ? Shall we see God, and not know his *Will* ? Yea, have *Angels* now so much work to do, rejoyce over men, and *Saints* shall judge the *World*, and shall we for ever have no work of *Obedience*, *Love*, *Joy* or *Praise* ?

And there will be *Executive Judgment* of Rewards and *Punishments* for ever. The Rebels will not be annihilated : *Their Worm dieth not*. And it is Christ the *Lamb* that is said to destroy them, and to bless the just. And this as *Believers* in Christ or *Unbelievers*, 2 *Thes.* 1. 6, 9, 10, 11. It

It is the sad case of the Church, that even studious Ministers must have new Books written, to answer every doubt that ariseth to them, and cannot answer them themselves.

I conclude, that 1. These men teach the Mahometans to vilifie Christ's Kingdom, and consequently the King himself, as if when the *sinful Kingdom* lasteth about six thousand years, Christ's *Glorious Sabbatical Kingdom* shall last but one, and then for ever be *spewed out with loathing* as neither *hot nor cold*, but *naked and miserable*.

2. That they tempt men to *Paganism*, and to take either the *Stoicks Revolutions*, or *Aristotle's Eternity of the World* as an Eternal Body and Effect of an Eternal Cause, to be better than the Gospel.

And did I expound [*Delivering up the Kingdom*] as grossly as they; I would rather fall into *Peter Sterry's* way, that *Christ hath three Natures*, *The Divine uniting it self to the first and noblest Creature*; and that *prime Created Nature* assuming the *Humanity*, and so *ex Ordine Naturæ* as *superangelical*, and *ex Ordine Libere Institutionis*, retaining the Humanity glorified by way of Reward, Ruling the World as the highest subordinate created Cause. I confess this would seem to accommodate us in expounding *Heb. 1. Col. 2. &c.* and to reconcile the *Arrians* to the Orthodox, if not to reconcile us to *Aristotle*, and them that think it unlikely, that God who now delighteth in his Creatures, should have none from and to eternity, but Himself? if Christ had a middle created *superangelical Nature* from. But we must not make Doctrines to accommodate us in our difficulties, especially such as the Church never commonly received. (Though I will not undertake to confute it.) But if I should grant this Doctrine (that the *Divine Eternal Word*, produced creatures in different Order, and produced the highest creature so as to *Unite* it self to it eminently as that by which he would make, or at least operate on the Inferiour; and that this prime Creature at least was God's Eternal Effect, and that this is either the *Natura Mentalis in Geneve*, comprehending that of Angels and Men, or some higher Nature above both, and that the Word in this Nature united was it that appeared to *Abraham, Moses, &c.* and after to Redeem Man assumed the Soul and Body of Man as a third Nature, by such an Hypostatical Union, as I have described,

cap. 3. in *End of Controversies*.] I say, should I grant them all this, I would never grant them against plain Scripture, that Christ's third Nature here received, dieth or ceaseth after the Thousand years, or that he continueth it Glorified to no use active or objective, and that he will not still be the Mediator of Fruition.

Nor shall I believe that we Men (no nor Angels) shall have no Existent Nature to Eternity, but what we had from Eternity in duration.

Or if their last Argument would hold, that [*eternal, and everlasting, and for ever and without End*] in the Promise, did mean but [*a long time*] as it doth oft in the Old Testament, I should leave this long time as known only to God (and all that should follow;) and not confine it, and all Christ's Humane Reign in Glory, to a Thousand years, upon so uncluding an Evidence, as one only obscure Text, *Rev. 20.* which may clearly be proved to have no such sense.

The Lord enlighten us.

F I N I S.
